MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS WESTERN DISTRICT

COMPLETE TITLE OF CASE

IN RE THE MATTER OF:

CHRIS A. AFRIDI,

Respondent,

v.

KENNETH CHARLES AUMAN,

Appellant.

DOCKET NUMBER WD70090

MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS WESTERN DISTRICT

DATE: February 2, 2010

Appeal from

The Circuit Court of Jackson County, Missouri The Honorable Margaret L. Sauer, Judge

APPELLATE JUDGES

Division Three: Welsh, P.J., and Pfeiffer and Mitchell, JJ.

ATTORNEYS

James T. Madison Kansas City, MO

Attorney for Respondent,

Kenneth Charles Auman Kansas City, MO

Appellant, pro se.

MISSOURI APPELLATE COURT OPINION SUMMARY MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS, WESTERN DISTRICT

IN RETHE MATTER OF:)
)
CHRIS A. AFRIDI,)
)
Respondent,)
v.)
)
KENNETH CHARLES AUMAN,)
,)
Appellant.)
PP	,

WD70090 Jackson County

Before Division Three Judges: James Edward Welsh, P.J., and Mark D. Pfeiffer and Karen King Mitchell, JJ.

Ken Auman (Auman) successfully defended Chris Afridi's petition for an order of protection filed. Appearing *pro se* before this court, Auman appeals the ruling of the Circuit Court of Jackson County (trial court) denying his motion for legal expenses and sanctions.

AFFIRMED.

Division Three holds:

Auman seeks to recover attorney's fees, expenses and costs based upon a liberal interpretation of Rule 77.01. Auman attempts (1) to couch his personal research efforts as "legal expenses," and (2) to characterize his entitlement to recovery as a "cost" contemplated by Rule 77.01. It is, however, undisputed that Auman does not have a license to practice law, and as such, his personal legal research efforts cannot be deemed "attorney" fees. Further, attorney's fees are not "costs" and, even if they were, there exists specific statutory authority which gives a trial court discretion in awarding attorney's fees in an adult abuse case.

In evaluation of Auman's other claims of costs, we first note that absent express statutory authority, courts have no inherent authority to award costs. In this instance, not only is there no express statutory authority permitting the taxation of costs, the statutory mandate is that the trial court is expressly forbidden from taxing costs against a petitioner in adult abuse cases commenced pursuant to sections 455.010 to 455.085.

Opinion by: Mark D. Pfeiffer, Judge February 2, 2010

THIS SUMMARY IS $\underline{\mathbf{UNOFFICIAL}}$ AND SHOULD NOT BE QUOTED OR CITED.